

***Remarks***

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-5 and 8-30 will be pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, and 21 are the independent claims.

By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 6-7 without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Applicant amends claims 1-3, 5, 12-14, 16, 21, 23, and 25-30. Unless otherwise indicated, the claim amendments are for purposes of clarity and not to overcome any other rejection in the Official Action. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-8, 16-18, 21 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(e) as being anticipated by Utgawa et al (U.S. Patent 6,529,640). Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled. Applicant traverses the rejection of remaining claims 1-5, 8, 16-18, 21, and 26 because the cited reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

For example, the cited reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a method or system configured for receiving two or more input pixels and forming two or more intermediate intensity values, each of the two or more intensity values (i) respectively corresponding to one of the two or more input pixels and (ii) being based upon a **respective one or more weighting factors**, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 21.

The Official Action cites reference characters A27a and A27b of FIG. 3 in the Utgawa reference, asserting that these elements are representative of first and second weighting factors. Applicant respectfully points out, however, that reference characters A27a and A27b are more accurately indicative of interpolation computing sections (see e.g., Utgawa col. 14, line 63). Pixel interpolation is performed within each of the

interpolation computing sections A27a and A27b (illustrated in FIG. 3) using the interpolation, or weighting, matrix values from an interpolation matrix (B), as shown in FIG. 6 (Utagawa col. 14, line 63 - col. 15, line 21). In other words, this single interpolation/weighting matrix (B) is used by each of the interpolation computing sections A27a and A27b.

Utagawa fails to disclose, teach, or suggest forming two or more intensity values (i) respectively corresponding to one or more of the two or more input pixels and (ii) being based upon **a respective one or more weighting factors**, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 21. By teaching that a single interpolation/weighting matrix (B) is used by each of the interpolation computing sections A27a and A27b, Utagawa, seems to teach forming it's intensity values based upon **the same** weighting factors. Utagawa fails to teach forming two or more intensity values, each based upon **a respective one or more weighting factors**, as taught in the instant invention.

It is respectfully pointed out that anticipation can only be established by a single prior art reference that discloses each and every element of the claimed invention. RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Therefore, since the cited reference fails to recite each and every element of Applicant's invention as required in claims 1, 16, and 21, claims 1, 16, and 21 are not anticipated by the cited reference and are therefore allowable.

Claims 2-5, 8, 17-18, and 26 respectively depend from claims 1, 16, and 21 and are therefore also allowable at least for the reasons claims 1, 16, and 21 are allowable, and for the specific features recited therein.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 9-11 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Utagawa et al (U.S. Patent 6,529,640) in view of Holst "Sampling, Aliasing, and Data fidelity for Electronic Imaging Systems, Communications, and Data Acquisition." Claims 12-15, 19, 20, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Utagawa et al (U.S. Patent 6,529,640) in view of Westell (EP-503,104 A1). Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Utagawa et al (U.S. Patent 6,529,640). Finally, claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C Sec. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Utagawa et al (U.S. Patent 6,529,640) in view of Brogliatti et al (U.S. 6,564,225). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As explained above with reference to the Section 102 rejections, Utagawa fails to disclose, teach, or suggest forming two or more intermediate intensity values, each (i) respectively corresponding to one or more of the two or more input pixels and (ii) being based upon a **respective one or more weighting factors**, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 21. Holst, Westell, and Brogliatti fail to resolve these deficiencies. Accordingly, the asserted combinations of references do not yield the claimed invention and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Furthermore, claims 9-15, 19-20, 22-25, and 27-30 depend from claims 1, 16, and 21. Therefore, claims 9-15, 19-20, 22-25, and 27-30 are also allowable at least for the reasons claims 1, 16, and 21 are allowable.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Theodore A. Wood  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 52,374

Date: April 27, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600